

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket Nos. 34299/34314/34358

STATE OF IDAHO,	)	2008 Unpublished Opinion No. 572
	)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	)	Filed: August 1, 2008
	)	
v.	)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
	)	
JUAN FRANCISCO LARA,	)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
	)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.	)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
	)	

---

Appeal from the District Court of the Fifth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Minidoka County. Hon. R. Barry Wood, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified three-year sentences with one-year determinate terms for issuing a series of insufficient funds checks by way of a common scheme, affirmed. Judgment of conviction and three-year determinate sentence for issuing a series of insufficient funds checks by way of a common scheme, and consecutive unified eight-year sentence with five-year determinate term for burglary, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Daniel W. Bower, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

---

PER CURIAM

These cases are consolidated on appeal. In Docket No. 34314, Juan Francisco Lara was charged with issuing a series of insufficient funds checks by way of a common scheme, Idaho Code § 18-3106(b)(f), and one count of burglary, I.C. § 18-1401. He was subsequently charged in Docket Nos. 34358 and 34299 with issuing a series of insufficient funds checks by way of a common scheme. In Docket No. 34314, the district court imposed a three-year determinate term on the insufficient funds conviction and a unified eight-year sentence with five years determinate on the burglary conviction. In Docket Nos. 34358 and 34299, the district court imposed a unified sentence of three years with one year determinate on each conviction. The district court ordered that the insufficient funds sentences would run concurrently with each other, and that the

burglary sentence would run consecutive to the insufficient funds sentences. Lara appeals, contending that all of the sentences should be served concurrently.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Lara's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.